Vaughn R Walker Law Office of Vaughn R Walker Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 2200 2 San Francisco, CA 94111 Tel: (415) 871-2888 3 Fax: (415) 871-2890 vrw@judgewalker.com 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 11 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 12 IN RE CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT) ANTITRUST **MDL No 1917** 13 LITIGATION Master Case No 3:07-cv-05944-SC 14 This Order Relates to: Individual Case No 3:11-cv-05514-SC 15 ORDER RE THOMSON'S MOTION TO **REINSTATE ECF NO 3914 RE SEARS'** 16 Individual Case No 11-cv-05514-SC PRIVATE LABEL DISCOVERY 17 Sears, Roebuck and Co & Kmart Corp 18 v Chunghwa Picture Tubes, Ltd, et al. 19 20 21 22 23 On August 3, 2015, the Thomson Defendants moved to reinstate the July 14, 24 2015 Report and Recommendation ("July 14, 2015 R&R" or "ECF No 3914") granting in part 25 Toshiba's 9/12/14 motion to compel a response to Interrogatory No 9 by providing the names 26 27 28 ORDER RE THOMSON'S MOTION TO REINSTATE ECF NO 3914 RE SEARS' PRIVATE LABEL DISCOVERY PAGE 1 OF 4 of the five highest-ranking Sears employees responsible for conducting, implementing or directing Sears' LXI private-label program during the relevant period.

Since the July 14, 2015 R&R (ECF No 3914) issued, Toshiba and Sears filed their stipulated dismissal with prejudice of all claims. ECF No 3831. On July 28, 2015, based on the parties' stipulation withdrawing Toshiba's Motion to Compel and requesting denial of the July 14, 2015 R&R as moot, Judge Conti denied the July 14, 2015 R&R as moot. ECF No 3938. This order and Sears' refusal to provide the ordered discovery precipitated Thomson's motion.

The Discovery Protocol requires coordination of discovery in this multi-district litigation (ECF No 1128). On August 24, 2015, the undersigned issued a report and recommendation construing the Discovery Protocol as allowing parties that remain in the litigation to continue with discovery motions filed by settling parties. That report recommended: "Toshiba's 9/12/14 motion to compel Sears/Kmart to provide additional discovery regarding their private label program" be "deemed pending or at issue notwithstanding the filing party's settlement or withdrawal of its role in the motion." ECF No 4015 at 5. On September 11, 2015, Judge Conti adopted ECF No 4015. ECF No 4054. Implicit in the court's adoption of ECF No 4015 was that Toshiba's 9/12/14 motion to compel private label discovery from Sears/Kmart remained pending and that Sears should comply with ECF No 3914.

In the meantime, on August 14, 2015, Sears' counsel sent a letter to the undersigned objecting to reinstatement of ECF No 3914 on the ground that "because Sears's relevant interrogatory response that was the subject of Toshiba's motion to compel did incorporate of [sic] the names of the five highest-ranking employees responsible for conducting, implementing, or directing Sears's LXI private- label program during the relevant period, no further action by the Court is necessary, and the Court should deny Defendants' request." Opposition at 1-2. Having reviewed ECF No 3914 and Sears' interrogatory response and incorporated Rule 30(b)(6) testimony, the undersigned understands Sears' position but finds it incorrect.

ORDER RE THOMSON'S MOTION TO REINSTATE ECF NO 3914 RE SEARS' PRIVATE LABEL DISCOVERY PAGE 2 OF 4

The July 14, 2015 R&R ordered as follows:

"Toshiba's motion to compel is **GRANTED** in part. Plaintiffs are ordered to provide the names of the five highest-ranking employees responsible for conducting, implementing or directing Sears' LXI private-label program during the relevant period. Toshiba's motion is **DENIED** in all other respects." ECF No 3914 at 8.

Sears correctly contends that its Response to Interrogatory No 9 *refers* to its Rule 30(b)(6) deposition testimony: "Plaintiffs further refer [Toshiba] to the Rule 30(b)(6) deposition testimony and to the deposition testimony of Glenna Hess on this exact topic." Exhibit A at 5. But this reference does not respond to the interrogatory's inquiry.

The portions of the Rule 30(b)(6) deposition testimony that Sears relies upon fail to disclose the five highest-ranking employees responsible for conducting, implementing or directing Sears' LXI private-label program during the relevant period. Sears' contention that its response "incorporate[d]" the names of the five highest-ranking individuals stretches what, in fact, Sears has provided. Merely incorporating deposition testimony that provides the names of more than five employees having managerial or vice presidential titles simply does not answer the question posed.

Contrary to Sears' contention that the information ordered by the R&R has already been provided, a review of Sears' submissions and responses to Interrogatory No 9 discloses that the information ordered has not been provided. Sears' opposition does not admit that the five named individuals were the five highest-ranking Sears employees responsible for conducting, implementing or directing Sears' LXI private-label program during the relevant period. If the five named persons are the five highest-ranking Sears employees with such responsibilities during the relevant time period, Sears should so state. Otherwise,

Sears should provide the names of those five highest-ranking employees.¹ Providing those 1 2 names together with any required explanation in responsive sentences would have been far 3 easier than opposing Thomson's motion. 4 5 **CONCLUSION** 6 The defendants' motion to reinstate ECF No 3914 (July 14, 2015 R&R) is 7 **GRANTED.** Sears shall serve a supplemental interrogatory response to Interrogatory No 9 as ordered in ECF No 3914 no later than October 15, 2015. 8 9 10 IT IS SO ORDERED. 11 Date: October <u>7</u>, 2015 12 13 Vaughn R Walker 14 United States District Judge (Ret) 15 The Recommended Order of the Special Master is Accepted and Ordered / Denied / Modified. 16 Date: _____ 17 18 19 Honorable Samuel Conti 20 **United States District Judge** 21 22 23 24 25 ¹ The undersigned understands that the term "five highest-ranking employees responsible for" involves some subjectivity in selecting individuals. The point of the ordered interrogatory response is to 26 determine the individuals with the greatest responsibility for Sears' private label program during the relevant period. 27 28 ORDER RE THOMSON'S MOTION TO REINSTATE ECF NO 3914 RE SEARS' PRIVATE LABEL DISCOVERY PAGE 4 OF 4